DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 007 SO 014 354

AUTHOR DeMartini, Joseph R.
TITLE Where Have All the Radicals Gone? Some Thoughts on the Consequences of Social Movement Participation.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (77th, San Francisco, CA, September 6-10, 1982). Document contains light print type.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Adults; Attitude Change; Behavior Theories; College Students; Family Influence; Followup Studies; Generation Gap; Peer Influence; *Political Attitudes; *Political Socialization; Social Action; Sociology
IDENTIFIERS *Social Movements

ABSTRACT

This document measures two sociological theories against patterns which emerge from six studies on former student activists. Because the existing data neither confirm nor contradict each theory, a third orientation is introduced. Briefly stated, the social integration theory suggests that former activists assume adult work roles, retreat from their former radical politics, and participate only in the traditional political system. The generational cohort perspective predicts that activists will reject full-time employment and adult careers, maintain radical political beliefs, and reject traditional forms of political participation. However, results of the six studies indicate that former activists move into adult work roles in education, human services, and creative occupations; maintain liberal/radical political beliefs and ideological preferences; and mix institutionalized and uninstitutionalized forms of political participation. These contradicting results illustrate the importance of considering the influence of political socialization before the college years. The maintenance of political beliefs and behaviors into adulthood is a result of forces operating between and within generations; political socialization is not isolated in college experiences. Thus, the three socializing forces of adult work roles, membership within a generation, and intergenerational political socialization account for how former activists integrate into adult life. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227007

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

WHERE HAVE ALL THE RADICALS GONE?: SOME THOUGHTS ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT PARTICIPATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph R. DeMartini

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Joseph R. DeMartini
Washington State University

SP 014 354

Presented at the 77th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Sept. 6 - 10, 1982, San Francisco, California

Where Have All the Radicals Gone?:

Some Thoughts on the Consequences of Social Movement Participation

ABSTRACT

Two theoretical traditions within sociology are reviewed as they provide the basis for predicting the consequences of participation in the student movements of the 1960s. Together, these traditions generate opposite predictions which are evaluated through a review of existing research on former student activists. Neither prediction adequately explains the data. The importance of intergenerational socialization to values supportive of dissident political beliefs and behavior is introduced as a means of accounting for the adult politics of former student activists.

If you are 20 and not a radical, you don't have a heart. If you are 40 and still a radical, you don't have a head.

Anonymous (1960's)

What has happened to the youthful participants in the student movements of the 1960's? Where are they? What are they doing? What are their current political beliefs and behaviors? The popular press suggests rather straightforward answers to these questions: Their youthful idealism spent, former student activists have abandoned their radical ideas, rejoined society, and are getting on with the business of making a living. Sociological theories and empirical research, however, are less certain. Two theoretical traditions within the discipline predict opposite futures for student movement participants while empirical studies of former student activists neither confirm nor deny the utility of one tradition over the other. This paper examines the theoretical arguments within each tradition as well as the empirical work available on former student activists. It concludes by proposing a synthesis of these theoretical frameworks through the addition of conceptual elements rooted in political socialization theory and research. This synthesis is offered as an alternative explanation of the empirical findings on former student movement participants.

Theoretical Traditions

The two theoretical traditions reviewed below are identified as social integration and generational cohort perspectives. Neither has roots specifically in the social movement literature though both have been used to explain the emergence of student movements (Braungart, 1974). Each focuses upon different social processes as the dynamic of its theoretical logic --

social integration emphasizes socialization and generational cohort stresses social change -- and each contains the ingredients of specific predictions regarding the effects of social movement participation.

The Social Integration Perspective: Social integration provides one answer to the fundamental problem of social order: societies maintain themselves over time by recruiting members from new generations, socializing them through the institutions of religion, family, and formal education, and sorting them into necessary social roles (Durkheim, 1933; Davis and Moore, 1945; Parsons, 1953; Dreeben, 1968). The ease with which new generations accept existing cultural prescriptions and assume available social roles, however, is inversely related to the rate of social change in society. Rapid social change produces dissimilarities in the sociohistorical experiences of adjacent generations; and dissimilarities increase the probability that these generations will hold different and/or conflicting sociocultural definitions and priorities (Davis, 1940; Friedenberg, 1959; Laufer, 1972). Accordingly, student movements represent qualitative breaks in the socialization and social integration of new generations.

The conditions which precipitate interruptions in the orderly processes of socialization and integration are outlined by a variety of authors. Eisenstadt (1956) and Parsons (1963) provide the framework for this outline when they write that the fundamental problem facing new generations in modern, Western societies is the difficult adjustment associated with moving from the particularistic environment of one's family to the increasingly universalistic environment of adult social roles, especially those of full-time work in a highly industrialized society. Formal education functions to ease this adjustment (Dreeben, 1968), but the added years of schooling necessary for employment and upward mobility (Collins, 1971) suspend students in a period of "role moratorium" and continue the potential for generational conflict (Parsons

and Platt, 1972). As schooling extends into college and post-graduate years, it groups persons of similar age sharing a state of social marginality while experiencing the same sociohistorical conditions within environments (universities) that often question societal structures and priorities (Keniston, 1967).

However, if the social integration perspective treats student movements as breaks in the socialization process, it also treats them as temporary and conducive to eventual social integration. Student movements are by definition a phenomenon of youth, and as such they are associated with an interim period of experience. Eisenstadt writes:

> Any cultural definition of youth describes it as a transitory phase, couched in terms of transition toward something new, something basically different from the past. Hence the acuteness of the problem of linkage. (Eisenstadt, 1963, p. 27)

He goes on to note that societies traditionally mark this transitory phase with a rite of passage which formally signals the movement from a youthful status to adulthood. Abrams (1970) uses Eisenstadt's discussion of the relations between generations to argue that the activities of rebellious youth are themselves a rite of passage. Abrams contends that student movement participation provides access to peer groups which assist in the definition of values while enabling students to cope with the powerlessness of non-adult status. The resulting opportunities for individual as well as collective action have the latent function of providing a vent for structurally based tensions and strain. Such action also provides the opportunity of forging new social roles within the social order through a process of "role seeking" -- i. e., an a ternative to anticipatory socialization which combines transition to adult status with attempts to effect specific social change (Pinner, 1964).

Viewed from this perspective, the extended period of student status experienced by young adults may be functional to the assumption of adult social

roles based upon an "activist" or achievement oriented component of value systems predominant in Western societies (Parsons, 1963). Parsons and Platt (1972) reflect this analysis in their examination of higher education, student movements, and the socialization process:

> Structured situations for groups of individuals . . . often do impose strains on participants, but the nature and significance of these strains may vary potentially having positive functions in the larger social system, rather than, for example,denoting malintegration (Parsons and Platt, 1972, p. 284).

While student movements reflect dissatisfaction with a social order perceived by persons experiencing lengthened periods of socialization in higher education, they act as mechanisms through which new generations define for themselves adult roles within that order.

The above analysis requires several qualifications before it is used to predict the futures of student movement participants. First, the assumption of adult roles signifying social integration does not require social movement failure nor reversal of values and goals held while a social movement participant. It suggests an accommodation between youthful idealism and the demands of adult social status -- an accommodation which both facilitates the successful occupation of this status and terminates active participation in the movement itself.

Second, to hypothesize that youthful participants in a social movement will become functioning members of a social order is to suggest that a given social order is extremely flexible and able to assimilate a variety of value orientations and political ideologies without undergoing fundamental structural change. The social integration perspective assumes that modern social systems function with a marked degree of cultural pluralism. While this pluralism may lead to incremental change in public opinion and public policy, it does not precipitate a basic alteration of economic or political structures.

Third, to suggest, as the social integration perspective does, that former student activists will assume adult social roles following their student movement participation is to say very little about what this means -- attitudinally and behaviorally. The perspective does maintain that there is a qualitative difference between former student activists today and during their student years. However, the nature of this difference and its empirical correlates are not specified except in the grossest way, i. e., persons who rejected many aspects of a given social order are now functioning members of that order. Such a dichotomy glosses over the complexity of the concept "social integration" and requires empirical operationalizations before the social integration perspective can be evaluated for its utility in predicting the consequences of student movement participation.

Fourth, it is important to note that the social integration perspective does not consider the socialization process by which values which legitimate dissident politics are transmitted from one generation to another. This perspective interprets intergenerational political socialization solely in terms of its role in maintaining dominant and traditional political beliefs and behaviors.

The Generational Cohort Perspective: This perspective combines Mannheim's (1952) analysis of generational relationships as a force for social change with recent empirical research on the aging process and analysis of age cohorts over time. Mannheim argues that the emergence of new generations provides the basis for social change. Generational membership, however, must be combined with commonality in geographical and sociohistorical experience in order for persons of the same generation to share a similar political consciousness and to engage in collective political action. He uses the term "generational units" to refer to politically conscious and active groups sharing a common generational location.

Mannheim drew extensive parallels between his treatment of generation and generational unit and Marx's use of class in itself and class for itself. In light of these similarities, the concepts of class consciousness and generational consciousness stand side by side. Strengthening these parallels is Mannheim's insistence that a generation is important only when understood through an analysis of the historical and structural experiences shared by its members. The commonality of these experiences sets the stage for the formation of significant and lasting cultural understandings and behavioral patterns. Writing about the consciousness of generational unit members, Mannheim emphasizes the importance of shared experience and the interpretation given to these experiences.

> Fundamental integrative attitudes and formative principles are all important also in the handing down of every tradition, firstly because they alone can bind groups together, secondly, and what is perhaps even more important, they alone are really capable of becoming the basis of continuing practice. (Mannheim, 1952, p. 305)

Mannheim is arguing here for the importance of shared experience and consciousness as a key factor in integrating group members. Personal experience, as it stands apart from the message of socialization provided from an adult generation, becomes an alternative to the type of generational continuity and social order assumed through a social integration perspective. The prospect for generational conflict is quite evident in this analysis. Mannheim laid the foundation for an understanding of student movement participation as a lasting rather than fleeting phenomenon. He suggested that such participation provided political and social world views that continued over time to help shape understandings of experiences in later life.

Research on the aging process has added to the importance of Mannheim's ideas, though this work has not formally tested hypotheses generated by Mannheim's analysis. Of particular interest to our concern is the examination of the aging process as it affects political attitudes and behavior (Bengtson,

et. al., 1977; Bengtson, and Black, 1973; Cutler and Bengtson, 1974, Glenn, 1974). An empirical analysis of age cohorts strongly qualifies the popular belief that the aging process causes persons to turn more conservative in attitudes or behavior. When individual cohorts are followed over time, political values and behaviors evidenced at a young age show much continuity. Hudson and Binstock (1976) conclude in their review of literature on this question that available data reflect "a general tendency of all people to retain their orientations as they age throughout the life cycle, or at least to change them more slowly as they grow older." (Hudson and Binstock, 1976, p. 380)

If such a conclusion can be drawn about whole cohorts -- which are quite heterogeneous in terms of shared experiences -- would it not hold true all the more within subsets of a cohort, i. e., generational untis, which are extremely homogeneous in political attitudes and behaviors? The theoretical implication of this argument clearly supports the thesis that generational units do not blend into a larger society with age thereby leaving behind the ideas and experiences encountered wher young. On the contrary, they should carry these ideas and experiences throughout life as a force which will shape their political consciousness and behavior.

This thesis, however, leaves the details of both consciousness and behavior quite open. As a result, specific predictions of former activists' future/politics require the clarification of several issues. First, the formative experiences of youthful participation in student movements do not reveal the form or content by which shared political consciousness will be manifested in later life. It is highly unlikely that former student radicals will continue the identical political activities which marked their involvement in the movement of the 1960s. The dissolution of political organizations active during that decade precludes such literal continuity.

Second, Mannheim did not rule out successive generational unit experiences which would cumulate with earlier experiences in shaping adult political consciousness and commitment. The ability of generational units to withstand the socialization pressures of adult careers is untested, though the generational cohort perspective suggests these pressures will not significantly reduce the importance of political consciousness stemming from collective, youthful experience.

Third, this perspective locates the dynamic of social change in a discontinuity between generations enhanced by the shared experiences of generational units. Like the social integration perspective, predictions based upon Mannheim's work do not consider intergenerational political socialization to dissident beliefs and behaviors. Using this perspective, the forces generating social change are born anew with each generation rather than emanating from the social change orientation of previous generations.

The Two Perspectives: Unanswered questions associated with both perspectives highlight the need to operationalize the consequences of social integration and generational cohort membership. The first perspective depicts former student activists assuming adult social roles through which they become active participants in a social system. The second portrays former student activists as collective change agents altering the social system of which they are a part. The first stresses intergenerational continuity; the second emphasizes intergenerational dissensus. The first is based in a theoretical tradition focusing upon the enduring nature of social order; the second emphasizes the enduring nature of consciousness created in a youth subculture.

The two theoretical perspectives reviewed here predict very different futures for participants in student movements. In order to evaluate the accuracy of these predictions and the corresponding utility of their conceptual foundations, available studies of former student activists are examined with

respect to three questions:

1) What are the current occupations of former student activists?
2) What are the current political beliefs of former student activists?
3) What are the current political behaviors of former student activists?

Answers to the first question will provide considerable help in evaluating the social integration perspective. This perspective argues that the major transition from youth to adult social roles takes place in the arena of occupation and work. Specific data on where former activists stand within this arena will better enable us to judge the degree to which these persons have experienced the social integration hypothesized by this perspective.

Answers to the first question alone, however, are insufficient to weigh the relative power of the two perspectives in question. While one would expect political values and beliefs to move in concert with the political milieu of different occupations and work environments, such an expectation must admit to great variability. It is both theoretically and empirically possible for former activists to hold rather traditional occupations while maintaining a political identification and belief system in accord with the movement in which they participated. A logical prediction based upon the generational cohort perspective is that this identification and belief system will have staying power throughout the life cycle. Answers to the second question will speak directly to this prediction and the perspective on which it is based.

Answers to the third question provide additional information useful for evaluating the two perspectives reviewed here. Do former activists engage in political action which continues their youthful commitments? An affirmative answer would strongly support the generational cohort perspective. A negative answer would lend support to the social integration perspective. All three question taken together, however, provide a variety of possible response combinations suggesting the possibility that neither of the two perspectives will emerge as more useful. For example, it is quite possible for former

activists to reject both adult occupations as well as the political beliefs and behaviors characteristic of their participation in the student movement. The following review of research on former student activists will shed some light on these issues.

Studies of Former Activists

Despite the many articles and stories which the mass media have provided on the whereabouts and activities of former student activists, very few systematic studies of former activists have been conducted. For student protests between 1960 and 1970, six studies are available which examine the behaviors and attitudes of former activists in the United States from four to 13 years following their initial protest activity.[1] The six studies report on former participants of four protest incidents: (1) male college students active in civil rights demonstrations in the South between 1960 and 1963; (2) college students active in the Free Speech Movement in 1964 at the University of California, Berkeley; (3) college students active in voter registration efforts in six southern states during the Summer of 1965; and (4) students enrolled at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and arrested in connection with the burning of a local branch of the Bank of America in 1970. Table 1 lists these studies along with the number of former activists contacted and the number of years separating incidents of protest activity and follow-up surveys.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Before examining these data, three cautions are in order. First, the cases of student protest span a 10 year period during which the focus and character of organized student political protest in the United States underwent marked change. As a result, these cases cannot be treated as parts of a single

student movement, even though our concern is with patterns which may emerge across these cases.

Second, follow up studies of former student activists vary in the number of years which have lapsed between political activity and the follow-up -- from 4 to 13 years -- as well as the historical period during which the follow-up took place. It is difficult to compare former activists four years after their involvement in an incident of public protest with former students who are ten years away from their political activity. Furthermore, former activists who engaged in political protest during the early 1960s experienced greater opportunity to remain involved in activities generated by the student movement throughout that decade than did students who were active in 1970 at the end of the movement. We expect, therefore, differences in political attitudes and behaviors when comparing former activists at different historical periods and at different 'distances' from their involvement in student political protest.

Third, the methodologies and orientations of these follow-up studies make comparison of their findings somewhat difficult. Three of the studies are highly qualitative (Greene, 1970; Demerath, et al., 1971; and Whalen and Flacks, 1980) while the remaining three are more quantitative (Fendrich and Tarleau, 1973; Fendrich, 1974; Maidenberg and Meyer, 1970; Nassi and Abramowitz, 1978). The studies vary in the extent to which they provide data regarding former activists' current occupations, political attitudes, and behaviors; and only one of the studies was designed for the purpose of comparison with previously existing research.[2]

Despite the limitations which characterize these data and the difficulties raised by comparing them, they are the best available source of information on former participants in America's student movement of the 1960s. (For a more detailed account of the studies from which these data are taken, see Appendix A.)

Data on Former Activists

Data contained in the six studies listed in Table 1 will be examined as they bear on the three questions used to evaluate the two theoretical traditions introduced at the beginning of this paper, i. e., 1) What are the current occupations of former student activists?; 2) What are the current political beliefs of former student activists?; 3) What are the current political behaviors of former student activists?

Occupations of Former Activists: The social integration perspective emphasizes a structural integration of former student activists into adult roles through the world of work. While such integration may not require significant change in the area of political beliefs and behavior, it does suggest a willingness to accommodate to the demands of various work roles which themselves may act as socializing forces to facilitate or discourage political activism. Hence, it is important to identify the degree to which former activists assume adult work roles following college as well as the type and variety of these roles.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Table 2 summarizes the available information on present occupations of former student activists. The variety of occupational categories used across the six studies reported in Table 2 make it difficult to compare these data. Three of the studies -- Demerath, et al., 1971; Greene, 1970; and Whalen and Flacks, 1980 -- are highly qualitative and did not present their accounts of former activists in terms of occupational categories; the occupations listed in Table 2 from these studies were taken from the text of each account. The remaining three studies use more comparable occupational categories.

Three patterns emerge from an overview of these data. First, very few former activists are reported to be unemployed. Occupational data are available for 14 of the 40 former students active in civil rights work in the Summer of 1965 (Demerath, et al., 1971) and for 28 former students who participated in or supported civil rights demonstrations in Florida between 1960 and 1963 (Fendrich and Tarleau, 1973). All but one of these students were employed at the time of the follow-up surveys. Six percent of the FSM activists surveyed by Maidenberg and Meyer (1970) were unemployed. None of the FSM activists surveyed by Greene (1970) and Nassi and Abramowitz (1978) were unemployed. The ten year follow-up study of UCSB student activists reports no unemployment among respondents. The vast majority of former student activists described in Table 2 had entered the public or private sectors from four to 13 years following their participation in student political protest during the 1960s.

Second, the proportion of former activists remaining in a student status decreases over time. Of the 14 civil rights activists interviewed by Demerath and his colleagues (1971) for whom occupational data are reported, six were still enrolled in school four years following their voter registration work. None of the 28 civil rights activists surveyed by Fendrich and Tarleau (1973) were students eight to 11 years following their participation in civil rights protests. Five years following their occupation of Sproul Hall on the Berkeley Campus in 1964, 35% of the FSM activists reported their occupations as "student" (Maidenberg and Meyer, 1970). Two former FSM activists interviewed by Greene (1970) were students in 1970. Thirteen years after the Sproul Hall sit-in, one of the 14 activists surveyed was classified as a student (Nassi and Abramowitz, 1978). Whalen and Flacks (1980) report that ten years after the burning of the Bank of America in 1970, one former activist interviewed occupied a student status.

Third, former activists tend to concentrate in certain occupational categories and not in others. Persons who had been active in the civil rights movement and the Free Speech Movement tend to work in education, creative occupations,[3] and human services. Demerath, et al. (1971) report that 28.5% of their former activists for who occupational data were available work in these areas. Over 80% of the former activists surveyed by Fendrich and Tarleau (1973) are employed in these areas. Very few former civil rights activists hold occupations in private business.

Five years after the beginning of the Free Speech Movement, 27% of the former FSM activists were in the teaching profession and 13% were in social work (Maidenberg and Meyer, 1970). Half of the FSM activists interviewed by Greene (1970) six years after their involvement were in academic or creative occupations, while half of the 14 former FSM activists surveyed 13 years following their participation in the movement worked in academic, social service or creative occupations (Nassi and Abramowitz, 1978).

The occupational data on students arrested in connection with the burning of the Bank of America in 1970 are quite limited. The five occupations reported for these former activists -- doctor, paralegal, nurse, social service worker, and student -- are skewed towards social service and creative occupations (see Footnote 3).

Political Beliefs of Former Activists: The maintenance of political beliefs shaped during a period of youthful political activity and commitment is fundamental to the notion of generational units discussed by Mannheim. One measure of the presence of a generational unit among former student activists is the extent to which activists hold political beliefs as adults similar to those they held as college students. While an investigation of continuity in political beliefs requires longitudinal research, only one (Nassi and Abramowitz, 1978) of the studies of former student activists use this

methodology. Other studies compare former activists' present political beliefs to the beliefs they recall holding as students (Maidenberg and Meyer, 1970), or compare the present political beliefs of former activists and non-activists (Fendrich and Tarleau, 1973). Political belief or commitment is most frequently measured by respondents' scores on a radicalism-conservatism scale, self-reported affiliation with political parties, and/or self-descriptions of one's political self identification on a continuum from radical to conservative.

Table 3 reports the political beliefs of student activists eight to 11 years following their participation in civil rights protests between 1960 and 1963.[4] These data are compared with the political beliefs of former students who had not engaged in political protest. Over half (54%) of the former activists identify themselves as "radical" and an additional 25% describe their political preferences as "liberal".

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Non-activists follow an opposite trend. Over half (57%) identify themselves as politically "moderate" while 30% choose the self-identification "conservative". A similar distribution of activists and non-activists on a 14-item radical-conservatism scale indicates that a majority of former activists lean towards radical political beliefs compared to a majority of non-activists who lean towards conservative political beliefs. While these data do not describe the degree of similarity between activists and former activists over time, they do indicate that former activists are not similar to their non-activists peers eight to 11 years after engaging in political protest behavior.

Two surveys of participants in the Berkeley Free Speech Movement use more direct measures of continuity in political beliefs over five year and 11 year

periods respectively. Maidenberg and Meyer (1970) asked respondents to place themselves on a political continuum from 1 (conservative) to 9 (radical) at three points in time: a) before participating in the FSM, b)immediately after they were arrested for occupying the University's administration building, and c) "today", i. e., the year Maidenberg and Meyer conducted their survey -- 1969. The average "radicalism" scores for these 230 respondents at the three time periods are 6.3, 7.5, and 7.4 respectively. The authors also note that of 163 rearrestees reporting an "appreciable" gain in radicalism as a result of participation in FSM activities, **70.6%** indicate they have retained this gain over the five years between being arrested and responding to the authors' survey.

Nassi and Abramowitz (1978) use a different method of assessing continuity in political beliefs and find some change over time. FSM arrestees were administered an 8-point radicalism-conservatism scale as a measure of political beliefs in 1966 and again in 1977. The authors indicate that political beliefs as measured by this scale did not strongly correlate over the 11 year period, although the mean score for the 1977 sample exceeded 6.6 on the 8-point scale. The political self-identification of these former activists remained quite left of center. The 14 arrestees responding to the 1977 follow-up study identified their political preference as follows: Anarchist, 1; Communist, 2; Socialist, 3; New Left, 1; Liberal Democrat, 6; and Libertarian, 1 (Nassi and Abramowitz, 1979).

Greene's (1970) report of interviews with 12 former FSM participants provides little systematic information about former activists' current political beliefs except for the author's summary comment that "Almost every (former) FSM member I talked to described himself . . . as a socialist."

Recognizing the differences in sample sizes and research methodologies characterizing these three studies of former FSM participants, two summary

statements are possible. First, former FSM participants are considerably left of center in their adult political beliefs. Whether these beliefs are measured by party preference, political self-identification, or scores on radicalism-conservatism scales, these former activists hold political beliefs which separate them from the mainstream of American politics.[5] Second, there is continuity in political beliefs over time for a significant portion of former FSM activists. While this continuity may weaken as activists age, there is no evidence that FSM activists assume political beliefs markedly different from those they held as college students.

Whalen and Flacks (1980) provide the most recent study of former student activists' present political beliefs through their qualitative study of 11 former activists using a "life history, intensive interview" research approach. Similar to the findings reported by Greene (1970), these authors write that former activists ". . . still hold radical or left-liberal beliefs." Summarizing their discussions with former activists and the impact of this activism upon their respondents' adult lives, Whalen and Flacks conclude: ". . . student radicals of the sixties have not substantially moderated their political convictions in their post-movement lives. Some are still involved in Left politics; those who are not still maintain a social conscience and political concerns that appear to be a direct result of their participation in student protest" (Whalen and Flacks, 1980, p. 224).

Political Behavior of Former Activists: The social integration and generational cohort perspectives suggest very different types of political behavior among former student activists. The first perspective implies that former activists will not continue participation in public protest and other types of "uninstitutionalized"[6] political action. The second perspective suggests that former activists will continue forms of political behavior consistent with the commitments they made as student activists even if this

involves action outside legitimate and institutionalized channels for exercising political influence and change. Only one (Nassi and Abramowitz, 1978) of the studies summarized here employs a longitudinal research design enabling one to assess the continuity of political behaviors over time. Other researchers describe former activists' present political behavior (Greene, 1970; Demerath, et al., 1971; Whalen and Flacks, 1980), report activists' accounts of their own political behaviors since participating in the student movement (Maidenberg and Meyer, 1970), or compare the present political behavior of former activists with samples of non-activists (Fendrich and Krauss, 1978). Political behavior is measured in a variety of ways to include: membership in political organizations, voting behavior, and self-reported political activities ranging from contributing money to political candidates to taking part in political demonstrations.

Fendrich and Krauss (1978) compare former civil rights activists and non-activists on two forms of political behavior eight to 11 years following their participation in desegregation efforts in the South. Respondents were asked if they participated in political demonstrations and/or political campaigns as adults. As noted in Table 4, former student activists were highly involved in both types of political behavior -- 74% and 70% respectively. This is appreciably more than the 7% and 47% of non-activists engaging in these two types of political behavior as adults.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Two cautions must be exercised when interpreting these data. First, these data are cumulative, i. e., they represent participation levels in two types of political behavior over an eight to 11 year period. We do not know the number of demonstrations or campaigns in which individual respondents participated.

Second, this participation is presented as the respondents' "adult" political behavior though no definition is given of adult social status (Fendrich, 1974) nor is a year stated beyond which respondents are assumed to occupy this status. If we assume that adulthood occurs when respondents leave a student status, these data may be interpreted to mean that 74% of the former student activists surveyed participated in at least one political campaign or organization between leaving school and 1971.

Fendrich and Tarleau (1973) provide additional data on the political behavior of former student activists through an inquiry into the types of political organizations these respondents join. Former activists hold membership in: leftist political organization -- 21%; anti-war organizations -- 11%; environmental organizations -- 14%; and civil liberties organizations -- 11%. (Similar data for non-activists are not available.)

A much more qualitative assessment of the present political behaviors of former civil rights student activists is presented by Demerath, et al. (1971). These authors divided their sample of 40 former activists on two dimensions which together provide an indicator of political activity. The first dimension is "alienation: an estrangement from and rejection of existing society and its institutions"; and "activism: the extent to which one works beyond the bounds of political propriety to achieve some change in society or in the lives of others in keeping with one's own political ideals" (Demerath, et al., 1979). Respondents were cross-tabulated on these dimensions, and grouped into four categories: Radicals (n=10), Reformists (n=13), Drop-outs (n=4), and Politically Disengaged (n=10). (Three respondents did not fit into these categories.) Radicals and reformists are alienated and non-alienated activists respectively. Drop-outs and politically disengaged are alienated and non-alienated non-activists respectively.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The first two categories concern us, and they comprise 27 and 35% respectively of the former activists categorized on these dimensions. Persons in the first of these categories -- radicals -- engaged in campus demonstrations after returning from the South, joined radical student organizations (e.g., SDS), applied for conscientious objector status, and worked to radicalize community and minority groups through participation in guerilla theatre groups and a black cultural revolution center. Reformists sought political and social change through more institutionalized channels such as work in legal aid centers, church-related activities, and teaching in ghetto schools. Radicals engaged in behavior which often took them "beyond the bounds of political propriety" while reformists were more likely to seek institutionalized political activity.

The political behavior of former participants in the Free Speech Movement has been measured through voting behavior, membership in political organizations, and self-reported political activities. All of these indicators suggest a reduction in radical political behavior over time. Table 5 summarizes the voting behavior of former FSM participants in 1968 and 1976.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

In the former election, the largest proportion (38%) of former activists voted for third party candidates followed by 34% voting for Humphrey and 22% refusing to cast ballots. Eight years later the vast majority (79%) of former activists surveyed voted for Carter while 21% voted for third party candidates. Republican party candidates did not receive support from former FSM activists in either election. These data suggest increased involvement in traditional political behavior among former activists along with decreased support for candidates challenging the two-party system.

The number of political organizations to which activists belonged decreased between 1966 and 1977. Over this 11 year period mean organizational membership fell from 4.1 to 1.3 (Nassi and Abramowitz, 1978). While Greene (1970) does not have longitudinal data, his interviews with former FSM activists reveals a split in his sample in terms of political behavior. Five respondents (42%) were classified as "politically inactive". The remaining seven (58%) were active in a variety of ways summarized by Greene as: member of the Communist party, involved as an anti-war activist, participated in political demonstrations, helped organize the Peace and Freedom Party, established the Radical Lawyers Guild, and helped establish an independent research center for activists. These data reveal that former FSM activists' level of involvement in non-electoral political activity measured in 1970 and again in 1978 had declined from its peak in the mid 1960s.

Whalen and Flacks (1980) interviewed 11 former activists 10 years after their involvement in the student movement. The interviews focused upon development or change in ideals and life styles as these reflected an ongoing adaptation to changing personal, social and political environments. As such, the interviews do not chronicle specific types of political behavior. However, the authors do assess an overall change in their respondents' level of political activity noting a decline in commitment to political action and/or a shift from political and public to personal and private courses of action.

Discussion

Summarizing the findings of the six studies reviewed above is hampered by sharp differences in sample size, research design, and measurement techniques. Despite the difficulties which these present, several patterns emerge descriptive of the occupations, political beliefs, and political behaviors of former student activists.

-- Former activists move from a student status into adult work roles with little or no unemployment.
-- These work roles are concentrated in the areas of education, human services, and creative occupations with very few former activists employed in the business sector.
-- Political beliefs and ideological preferences remain heavily skewed toward liberal/radical values.
-- Former activists continue to be politically active, but tend to mix institutionalized with uninstitutionalized forms of political participation.
-- There appears to be more slippage in the maintenance of radical political behavior compared to radical political beliefs, though differences between former activists and non-activists are clearly present in both areas.

Rather than resolve the debate between social integration and generational cohort predictions of the consequences of participation in the student movement, these findings provide evidence to support both theoretical perspectives.

From the standpoint of the social integration perspective, former activists have assumed positions within the existing social order through the occupation of adult work roles and professional careers. Former activists have not dropped out of society, abandoning both the values and commitments they held while participants in the political protest of the 1960s as well as jobs and careers which bring them into the working and middle class status of their peers. Nor have these former activists pursued radical political beliefs and actions which would cut them off from the socializing pressures of full-time work while channeling them towards an increasingly radical and confrontation-based political commitment. Instead, former activists have moved into adult work roles -- the crucial arena of social integration for this theoretical perspective -- while increasing participation in acceptable and institutionalized channels for political participation.

Liberal to radical political beliefs have been maintained, but are integrated with forms of work and political action which suggest a decrease in estrangement from the dominant social and political order. Former activists

exhibit an apparent willingness and ability to pursue these beliefs within the confines associated with traditional forms of employment and political participation. The fact that former activists retain a social change orientation in their political beliefs reinforces the assumption behind a social integration perspective that current American political structures are sufficiently flexible to accommodate a diversity of political ideologies and orientations. This flexibility provides avenues through which these orientations can be pursued without excluding their proponents from the more general forms of social integration and participaption found in the workplace and professional careers.

From the standpoint of a generational cohort perspective, however, the social integration of former student activists has been minimal while the continuation of their student political commitments has been strong. Former activists remain very liberal to radical on a variety of measures which identify political beliefs. Continuity in political beliefs over time strongly suggests the formation of a generational unit which facilitated the development of distinctive political values within these samples of former student activists. Generational unit membership provided a lasting base on which these values were founded enabling their continuation even though activists have moved out of a student status and the educational environments so conducive to youthful political commitments.

Former activists have clearly not rejected the political beliefs which they espoused as students and they have not blended into an adult society such that they are indistinguishable from their non-activist peers. Nor have former student activists abandoned their political commitments as part of a general estrangement from all political orientations and action. Rather, former activists have moved into society carefully choosing careers and occupations which allow a continuation of their political interests. The relatively high

rates of political participation are evidence of attempts to act upon political commitments, and this activist orientation persists well into adulthood.

The utility of the social integration perspective over the generational cohort perspective would have been established had former activists assumed adult work roles, retreated sharply from their former radical political beliefs, and rejected all but the most traditional forms of political participation. On the other hand, the generational cohort perspective would be preferred had former activists rejected full-time employment and adult careers, maintained political beliefs in accord with those they held as students, and rejected traditional forms of political participation in favor of collective acts of political protest. Neither of these scenarios, however, emerge from these data. Instead, former student activists appear to occupy a middle ground between these two extremes.

The fact that neither theoretical perspective is clearly more useful or accurate in explaining these data is due to the assumptions which lie behind the questions asked of these data. Both perspectives are used to investigate possible similarities and differences between student activists and adult former activists. To compare college and adult beliefs and behaviors, however, is to make two implicit assumptions about the nature and importance of participation in student political protest, and in the more general case, about the importance of social movement participation.

Assumption #1: Student activism is the starting point from which change or continuity in political beliefs and behavior should be measured.

Both theoretical perspectives reviewed in this paper operate on this assumption by asking how the political beliefs and behaviors of participants in the student movement stand up over time. Do former student activists move away from the belief and behaviors which characterized them as students, i. e., the

social integration perspective; do they maintain these beliefs and behaviors into adulthood, i.e., the generational cohort perspective?

Assumption #2: Former student activists will be subject to socialization cross-pressures from occupational roles and generational unit membership.

Each theoretical perspective focuses upon one of these socialization agents as the most important factor shaping adult political beliefs and behaviors. Former activists who respond to the socialization pressures emanating from adult work roles should exhibit political beliefs and behaviors consistent with the social integration perspective. Former activists who carry out the commitments established and reinforced through generational unit membership should conform to the expectations of the generational cohort perspective.

Both of these assumptions, however, are open to challenge. A variety of research is available which suggests that the student activists of the 1960s acted upon political beliefs which preceded their college experience and were reinforced by family socialization (Westby and Braungart, 1966; Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1968; Block, et al., 1969; Bengston, 1970; Thomas, 1971). Given the value base upon which it was founded, student political protest was less the beginning of political consciousness and action than it was a continuation and specification of pre-existing political commitments. To compare former activists' adult political beliefs and behaviors to the beliefs and behaviors they manifested as students is to make a comparison which suggests that participation in the student movement was the starting point of political commitment and action. Indeed, none of the studies reviewed here provide information on the political orientations and actions of former activists prior to their involvement in the student movement.

If student political protest was rooted in political values which predated the college experience, then it was an instance of political behavior which must be understood in terms of its origins. Predicting the future political

beliefs and behavior of former student activists requires an understanding of how these political origins manifest themselves over the life cycle, i. e., through the college years and into adulthood. The flow or development of these beliefs and behaviors is cumulative so that adult beliefs and behaviors are a consequence of earlier commitments and action which include the college years as well as those which came before them. We should look at adult politics in terms of continuity with or divergence from this earlier socialization rather than comparing only the adult and college years. The fact that adult political values and beliefs may be very much in accord with pre-college political socialization but different in intensity or form from the politics of one's college years will produce both continuity and change depending upon the points of comparison. The social integration and generational cohort perspectives ask questions about former student movement participants which limit the range of comparisons which should be made and thereby overlook the history and development of adult political beliefs and behaviors.

While former student activists will certainly be subject to socialization pressures stemming from the workplace as well as from generational unit membership, a recognition of the existence and import of pre-college political socialization influences suggests that the workplace and generational unit are not the only -- and perhaps not the most important -- agents of socialization affecting adult political beliefs and behaviors. Recent research findings suggest that persons make job and career choices which coincide with the social, political, and economic values they hold before they enter college and/or adult work roles. (O'Kane, et al., 1977; Mortimer and Lorence, 1979, Lorence and Mortimer, 1979). While this does not mean there is no change in these values beyond adolescence, it argues for an understanding of change as a result of interaction between work and pre-work socialization forces. Adult

work role socialization pressures are less independent variables determining adult politics than they are forces to which persons construct adaptations shaped in large part by the context of one's early political socialization.

Family political socialization also interacts with the influence of generational unit membership. While generational units may well have crystallized for politically active college students during the 1960s, the values they used to interpret and act upon shared sociohistorical experiences preceded the students' entrance into college and enabled them to arrive at similar political consciousness. It is logical to expect that students will carry these values into adulthood. Given the familial origins of these values, the adult politics of former student activists results from both intergenerational influences in the form of early political socialization and intrageneration influences stemming from generational unit membership. The maintenance of political beliefs and behaviors into adulthood, then, is a function of forces operating within as well as between generations.

Challenging the above two assumptions raises the probability that intergenerational political socialization to values supportive of dissident political beliefs and behaviors is an important determinant of the adult politics of former student activists. This type of political socialization is ignored by both theoretical perspectives reviewed here. The generational cohort perspective predicts a continuation and possible widening of the gap between generations. The social integration perspective predicts a narrowing of the gap. The intergenerational political socialization of student activists suggests there is no gap to be either continued by former activists who maintain their political commitments into adulthood or bridged by those who chose to "return" to the influences of family political socialization.

Intergenerational political socialization acts as a unifying thread linking adjacent generations while providing the impetus for social change. As

such, it provides a degree of synthesis for social integration and generational cohort perspectives. The data reviewed here clearly demonstrate that the formation of generational units does not prevent generational unit members from integrating into the existing occupational structure; nor does social integration require a negation of influence from generational unit membership. The three socializing forces of adult work roles, generational unit membership, and intergenerational political socialization work simultaneously to help shape adult political beliefs and behaviors. Combined, these three forces account for the integration of former student activists into adult roles, the maintenance of leftist political values into adulthood, and the continuation of political behaviors tempered by the availability and efficacy of specific vehicles for political involvement.

Conclusion

This review of research on former participants in the student movements of the 1960s highlights several points. 1) Previous investigations into the adult experiences of former activists tends to be guided by a dichotomous query which asks if activists remain radical or return to moderate (mainstream) political commitments and action. 2) Attempts to hypothesize answers to the question have called upon two theoretical traditions or perspectives within sociology each supporting opposite predictions. 3) Data on the occupations, political beliefs and behaviors of former activists confirm neither prediction over the other and thereby cast doubt on the utility of a single theoretical tradition. 4) The introduction of a third theoretical orientation -- political socialization -- suggests: (a) considerable intergenerational similarity and continuity between activists and their parents in terms of political beliefs and behavior; (b) a need to rephrase the question regarding what happens to former student activists in order to admit more than two possible outcomes; and (c) social integration and generational cohort perspectives are most useful

when they incorporate political socialization and entertain a variety of possible outcomes.

Recognizing the importance of political socialization as an explanatory factor in the occurrence of the 1960s student movement leads one to ask not whether former activists will remain true to their youthful political commitments, but how these commitments will mesh with other aspects of adult life. The data reviewed here strongly argue for the conclusion that inter- and intra-generational influences extend into adulthood and coexist with traditional occupational roles and the constraints they imply.

The anonymous axiom quoted at the start of this paper cautioned those interested in the student movement of the 1960s that the turmoil of that period would be temporary. It suggested that radical students would temper their commitments with age, reason would prevail over emotion, and political protest would remain a youthful phenomenon rather than following student movement activists into adulthood. This paper has argued that heart and head are not mutually exclusive influences which shape specific political commitments and action. The beliefs and behaviors of student activists were not totally abandoned upon graduation, nor were they carried forth unchanged into adulthood. Tensions between youthful values and adult roles determine when and how former activists will be politically active. Whatever form this action takes, it will probably not be a resurrection of dissident, collective protest mirroring the experience of the 1960s; nor will it be devoid of the political beliefs which dominated the student movement of that decade.

Perhaps the most important political influence which former activists exercise as adults will take the same form as the influence these activists received from their parents, i. e., the transmission of political values to a new generation which will use them as a base for political and generational consciousness and action. As agents of political socialization, former

activists will build connections between generations enabling a motivating force which supported political action in the 1960s (and 1930s) to continue rather than die with the termination of the social movement which it fostered. Conceptualizing the issue of political stability and change in terms of socialization focuses attention upon the process by which intergenerational continuity may coexist and even reinforce collective efforts at social change.

TABLE 1

Follow-up Studies of Participants in Student Movement Activities Between 1960 and 1970

Student Movement Activity	Year of Participation	Year of Follow-up	Years Lapsed Between Participation and Follow-up	Sample Size
Students' Public Support of Desegregation efforts in Tallahassee, FL (Fendrich & Tarleau, 1973; Fendrich & Krauss, 1978)	1960-1963	1971	8 - 11	28
Occupation of a University Building during the Free Speech Movement, University of California, Berkeley Maiderberg & Meyer, 1970)	1964	1969	5	230
Participation in the Free Speech Movement, University of California, Berkeley (Greene, 1970)	1964	1970	6	12
Occupation of a University building during the Free Speech Movement, University of California, Berkeley (Nassi & Abramowitz, 1978)	1964	1977	13	15
Participation in SCOPE and Voter Registration work in Six southern States (Demerath, et al., 1971)	1965	1969	4	40
Participation in Demonstration Associated with the Burning of the Bank of America, University of California, Santa Barbara (Whalen & Flacks, 1980)	1970	1980	10	11

TABLE 2

Current Occupation of Former Student Activists

CIVIL RIGHTS

Occupation[1]	Activists %	Activists n
Student	42.9	6
Teacher	21.4	3
Armed Forces	14.3	2
Computer Programmer	7.1	1
Public Health Worker	7.1	1
Unemployed	7.1	1
TOTAL	99.9	14

Occupation[2]	Activists %	Activists n
Academic Professionals	53.6	15
Social Service and Creative Occupations	28.6	8
Government Workers	7.1	2
Proprietor, Manager Salesman or Official in Private Business	7.1	2
Private-Practice Professional	3.6	1
TOTAL	100.0	28

FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT

Occupation[3]	Activists %	Activists n
Student	35	81
Teacher	27	62
Social Worker	13	30
Clerical	10	23
Housewife	7	16
Military	1	2
Unemployed	6	14
TOTAL	99	228

Occupation[4]	Activists %	Activists n
Academic Professional	20	2
Writer	20	2
Student	20	2
Editor	10	1
Lawyer	10	1
Machinist	10	1
Political Activist	10	1
TOTAL	100	10

Occupation[5]	Activists %	Activists n
Social Service or Creative Occupation	35.7	5
Private Industry	21.4	3
Academic Professional	14.3	2
Private Practice	7.1	1
Government	7.1	1
Student	7.1	1
Construction Laborer	7.1	1
TOTAL	99.8	14

BANK BURNING

Occupation[6]	Activists %	Activists n
Doctor	20	1
Paralegal	20	1
Nurse	20	1
Social Service Worker	20	1
Student	20	1
TOTAL	100	5

Sources

1 Demerath, et al., 1971. Occupational data are available on 14 of 40 respondents.
2 Fendrich and Tarleau, 1973.
3 Maidenberg and Meyer, 1970.
4 Greene, 1970. Occupational data are available on 10 of 12 respondents.
5 Nassi and Abramowitz, 1978.
6 Whalen and Flacks, 1980. Occupational data are available on 5 of 11 respondents.

TABLE 3

Political Beliefs of Former Civil Rights Activists and Non-Activists (%)

Political Beliefs	(n=28) Activists	(n=67) Non-Activists
Radical	54	0
Liberal	25	13
Moderate	21	57
Conservative	0	30
TOTAL	100	100

Source: Fendrich and Krauss, 1978

TABLE 4

Political Behavior of Former Civil Rights Activists and Non-Activists (%)

Political Behavior	(n=28) Activists	(n=67) Non-Activists
Participated in Political Demonstrations as Adults	74	7
Participated in Political Campaigns and Organizations as Adults	70	47

Source: Fendrich and Krauss, 1978

TABLE 5

Voting Behavior of Free Speech Movement Participants, 1968 and 1976 (%)

Presidential Candidate	(n=230)* 1968	(n=14)** 1976
Humphrey	34	
Nixon	0	
Wallace	0	
Other	38	
Deliberate No Vote	22	
Ineligible	4	
TOTAL	98*	
Carter		79
Ford		0
Gus Hall		7
Other		14
TOTAL		100

*Maidenberg and Meyer, 1970. The authors do not report 1968 voting behavior for 2% of their sample.
**Nassi and Abramowitz, 1978.

FOOTNOTES

1. In order to facilitate the comparison of studies on former student activists, research on Black (Fendrich, 1976; 1977) and Japanese (Krauss, 1974) student activists are excluded from the data reviewed in this paper. For a comparison of White, Black, and Japanese former student activists, see Fendrich and Krauss (1978).
2. The survey by Nassi and Abramowitz (1978) compared respondents on a variety of sociopsychological variables originally used by Haan, et al. (1968) in their 1967 survey of arrestees.
3. While this occupational category is used by Fendrich and Tarleau (1973) and Nassi and Abramowitz (1978), its empirical referents are not specified. Fendrich and Tarleau (1973) describe this occupational category as one offering an "opportunity to express creativity" associated with the value of self-expression and people-orientation. Fendrich references Rosenberg (1957) who found the value of self-expression and/or people-orientation to be most strongly associated with the following occupational preferences: architecture, journalism-drama, art, social work, medicine, and teaching.
4. Demerath et al. (1971) does not report the political beliefs of former civil rights activists interviewed in 1969. Consequently, their study is omitted from this discussion.
5. The political beliefs of former student activists differ markedly from those held by a cross-section of the national population. Respondents to a 1976 Gallup Poll described their political positions as follows: Far Left, 3%; Substantially Left of Center, 5%; Moderately Left of Center, 10%; Just Slightly Left of Center, 13%; Middle of the Road, 10%; Just Slightly Right of Center, 19%; Moderately Right of Center, 17%; Substantially Right of Center, 7%; Far Right, 6%; Don't Know, 10% (Gallup, 1978).

6. Fendrich and Tarleau (1973) use this term to describe the behavior of civil rights activists. It refers to collective attempts to bring about social change "outside of ideologically legitimated channels" (Ash, 1972) and implies rejection of these channels as effective and acceptable sources for action.

7. The proportion of former student activists choosing business careers is small, especially when compared to the occupations chosen by non-activists. Fendrich and Tarleau (1973) report that the non-activists in their sample were five times more likely to choose careers in business than activists were.

8. Though studies of Black former student activists are not treated in this paper, it is interesting to note that Blacks who participated in desegregation efforts in the South between 1960 and 1963 are an exception to this pattern. For an explanation, see Fendrich (1977) and Fendrich and Krauss (1978).

APPENDIX A

The data reviewed in this paper are drawn from six studies of white former student activists who participated in some aspect of the student movement between 1960 and 1970. These activities are divided into three categories and summarized below. Also included in this summary is a brief review of methodologies used in each study of former activists.

Civil Rights: Two studies have examined former students who were active in some aspect of the civil rights movement in the South between 1960 and 1965. The first looks at white college students from Northern states who participated in the 1965 Summer Community Organization and Political Education (SCOPE) project (Demerath, et al., 1971). SCOPE was a sub-organization of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and was formed for the purpose of organizing over 300 volunteers who worked for 2-1/2 months during the Summer of 1965 in voter registration activity throughout six Southern States; Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. Demerath and his colleagues surveyed 166 of these students at the start and end of the Summer activities. These 166 respondents formed the population from which 40 persons were selected for telephone interviews four years later. The authors indicate these interviews were highly qualitative and neither systematic nor representative of the 1965 survey respondents.

The second follow-up of persons who participated in the civil rights movement surveyed 50 white, male students enrolled at Florida State University who, between 1960 and 1963, attempted to desegregate lunch counters and movie theatres in Tallahassee, Florida, or took public action in support of these desegregation efforts (Fendrich and Tarleau, 1973; Fendrich, 1974, 1976, 1977). In addition to the data on former student activists, this study also provided information on two control groups: 50 male students active in the university's student government and 50 male students classified as "non-involved". The three

groups form a continuum from radical political activity through traditional political activity to no political activity thereby allowing for comparisons across degrees of political involvement as well as across time.

Free Speech Movement: Three studies report survey data on former University of California students active in the Free Speech Movement (FSM) which originated on the Berkeley campus. This movement championed the rights of college students to use university property in soliciting money and volunteer support for civil rights work in the South. University officials initially denied students the right to use university property for such activities and large scale student protests ensued. The most famous of these was a massive "sit-in" during which students occupied the university's administration building, Sproul Hall, in December, 1964. Police arrested 761 persons approximately 600 of whom were students at the Berkeley campus. Two surveys have been conducted of these student arrestees. The first was done in 1969, five years after the sit-in. Questionnaires were mailed to all students who were arrested, and survey findings are reported on the 230 respondents who returned questionnaires (Maidenberg & Meyer, 1970).

A second survey of these same arrestees was conducted in 1977, 13 years after the Sproul Hall sit-in (Nassi and Abramowitz, 1978). Fifteen students who participated in the sit-in and were arrested returned mailed questionnaires. The vast difference in sample sizes (230 and 15) prevents a strict comparison of survey findings. The two surveys, however, comprise the only instance where former student activists have been examined at two different time periods (i.e., five and 13 years, respectively) following their original protest behavior.

A third study of persons participating in the Free Speech Movement examined a small number of students who were active in FSM throughout its short history rather than limiting itself to students arrested in December, 1964, (Greene, 1970). Greene personally interviewed 12 former participants, most of whom

played leading roles in the FSM. Like the work of Maidenberg and Meyer, Greene's survey is a journalistic account of his research topic. It is the most qualititative of the three studies of FSM activists.

Bank Burning: The final study which provides data for this paper reports the results of lengthy interviews with 11 former students at the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB), who were arrested in connection with a mass student riot during which the Isla Vista branch of the Bank of America was burned (Whalen and Flacks, 1980). The 11 persons interviewed, both male and female, were chosen from a larger group of 25 persons arrested in connection with the riot, bank burning, and campus demonstrations surrounding these events. Respondents had all been members of the Radical Union, a loosely organized radical student organization on the UCSB campus. The 11 persons interviewed were purposely chosen so as to vary from "still politically active" to "withdrawn from organized politics".

This follow-up study of former student activists is important for two reasons. First, it focuses upon students who were active during the last period of the 1960s student movement, a period markedly different in issues, ideology, and tactics from the pre-1965 period from which all other students have been drawn. Second, the follow-up of student activists was conducted in 1980, long after student movement organizations and activities had disappeared from most college campuses.

REFERENCES

Abrams, Philip

1970 "Rites de passage: the conflict of generations in industrial society." Journal of Contemporary History 5: 175-190.

Ash, Roberta

1972 Social Movements in America. Chicago: Markham.

Bengston, Vern L.

1970 "The generation gap: a review and typology of social-psychological perspectives." Youth and Society 2: 7-32.

Bengston, Vern L. and K. Dean Black

1973 "Intergenerational relations and continuities in socialization." Pp. 207-234 in P. Balter and K. Schaie (eds.) Life-Span Development Psychology: Personality and Socialization. New York: Academic Press.

Bengston, Vern L., Patricia L. Kasschan, and Pauline K. Ragan

1977 "The impact of social structure on aging individuals." Pp. 327-353 in J. Birress and K. Schaie (eds.), Handbook of the Psychology of Aging. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Block, J. H., N. H. Haan, and M. B. Smith

1969 "Socialization correlates of student activism." Journal of Social Issues 25: 143-177.

Braungart, Richard G.

1974 "The sociology of generations and student politics: a comparison of the functionalist and generational unit models." Journal of Social Issues 30: 31-54.

Collins, Randal

1971 "Functional and conflict theories of educational stratification." American Sociological Review 36: 1002-1019.

Cutler, Neal and Vern L. Bengston

1974 "Age and political alienation: maturation, generation and period effects." Journal of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences 415: 160-175.

Davis, Kingsley

1940 "The sociology of parent-youth conflict." American Sociological Review 5: 523-535.

Davis, Kingsley and W. E. Moore

1945 "Some principles of stratification." American Sociological Review 10: 242-49.

Demerath II, N. J., Gerald Manwell and Michael T. Aiken

1971 Dynamics of Idealism. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dreeben, Robert

1968 Oh What is Learned in School. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Durkheim, Emile

1956 The Division of Labor in Society. New York: Free Press.

Eisenstadt, S. N.

1956 From Generation to Generation. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

1963 "Archetypal patterns of youth." Pp. 24-42 in Erik H. Erikson (ed.), Youth: Change and Challenge. New York: Basic Books.

Fendrich, James M.

1974 "Activists ten years later: a test of generational unit continuity." Journal of Social Issues 30: 95-118.

1976 "Black and white activists ten years later: political socialization and adult left-wing politics. "Youth and Society" 8:81-104.

1977 "Keeping the faith on pursuing the good life." American Sociological Review 42: 144-157.

Fendrich, James M. and Ellis S. Krauss

1978 "Student activism and adult left-wing politics: a causal model of political socialization for black, white, and Japanese students of the 1960s generation." Pp. 231-255 in Louis Kriesberg (ed.), Research in Social Movements, Conflicts, and Change. Greenwich, Conn.: Jai Press.

Fendrich, James M. and Alison T. Tarleau

1973 "Marching to a different drummer: occupational and political correlates of former student activists." Social Forces 52: 245-253.

Feuer, Lewis

1969 The Conflict of Generations. New York: Basic Books.

Flacks, Richard W.

1967 "The liberated generation: an exploration of the roots of student protest." Journal of Social Issues 23: 52-75.

Friedenberg, E.

1959 The Vanishing Adolescent. Boston: Beacon Press.

Gallup, George

1978 The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1972-1977. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, Inc.

Glenn, Norval

1974 "Aging and conservatism." The Journal of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 415: 176-186.

Greene, Wade

1970 "Where are the Saviors of Yesteryear." New York Times Magazine, July 12.

Haan, N., M. B. Smith and J. H. Block

1968 "Moral reasoning of young adults: political-social behavior, family background and personality correlates." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 10: 183-201.

Hudson, Robert B. and Robert H. Binstock

1976 "Political systems and aging." Pp. 369-400 in Robert H. Binstock and Ethel Shanas (eds.), Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Kenniston, Kenneth

1967 "The sources of student dissent." Journal of Social Issues 23: 108-137.

1968 Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

1970 "Youth: a 'new' stage of life." The American Scholar 39: 631-54.

Krauss, Ellis S.

1974 Japanese Radicals Revisted. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Laufer, R.

1972 "Sources of generational conflict and consciousness." in P. Altbach and R. Laufer (eds.), The New Pilgrims: Youth Protest in Transition. New York: David McKay.

Lorence, Jon and Jeylan T. Mortimer

1979 "Work experience and political orientation: A panel study." Social Forces 53: 651-676.

Maidenberg, Michael and Philip Meyer

1970 "The Berkeley Rebels: Five Years Later." Detroit Free Press (February 1-7).

Mannheim, Karl

1952 "The problem of generations." Pp. 276-320 in Karl Mannheim, Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Routledge and Kegan.

Mortimer, Jeylan T. and Jon Lorence

1979 "Work experience and occupational value socialization: a longitudinal study." American Journal of Sociology 84: 1361-1385.

Nassi, Alberta J. and Stephen I. Abramowitz

1979 "Transition or transformation? personal and political development of former Berkeley free speech movement activists." Journal of Youth and Adolescence 8: 21-35.

O'Kane, James M., Lloyd Barenblatt, Philip K. Jensen, and Lillian T. Cochran

1977 "Anticipatory socialization and male Catholic adolescent socio-political attitudes." Sociometry 40: 67-78.

Parsons, Talcott

1953 "A revised analytical approach to the theory of social stratification." Pp. 92-128 in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Class, Status and Power. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

1963 "Youth in the context of American society." Pp. 93-119 in Erik H. Erikson (ed.), Youth: Change and Challenge. New York: Basic Books.

Parsons, Talcott and Gerald Platt

1972 "Higher education and changing socialization." Pp. 237-291 in Matilda W. Riley, Marilyn Johnson and Anne Foner (eds.), Aging and Society: Volume Three: A Sociology of Age Stratification. New York: Russell Sage.

Pinner, Frank

1964 "Student trade-unionism in France, Belgium, and Holland." Sociology of Education 37: 177-199.

Rosenberg, Morris

1957 Occupations and Values. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Thomas, L. E.

1971 "Political attitude congruence between politically active parents and college-age children." Journal of Marriage and the Family 33: 375-386.

Westby, David L. and Richard G. Braungart

1966 "Class and politics in the family backgrounds of student political activists." American Sociological Review 31: 690-621.

Whalen, Jack and Richard Flacks

1980 "The Isla Vista 'bank burners' ten years later: notes on the fate of student activists." Sociological Focus 13: 215-236.